REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 11-13 were pending in the instant application as of the issuance of the Office Action. Claims 6, 7 and 13 were previously withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected invention. According to the foregoing Amendments to the Claims, claims 1, 3, 11 and 12 have been amended, new claims 14-18 have been added and claim 8 has been cancelled without prejudice to its prosecution in this or a subsequently filed application. Accordingly, upon entry of the amendments presented herein, claims 1-7 and 11-18 will remain pending in the application.

Support for the amendments to the claims and the introduction of new claims can be found throughout the specification and in the claims as originally filed. Specifically, support for the amendment to claim 1 and for new claims 14-18 can be found at page 7, line 25 to page 8, line 11, and at page 22, line 4 to page 23, line 9.

No new matter has been added by the claim amendments or new claims presented herein. The amendments to the claims and cancellation of certain claims should not be construed as an acquiescence to the validity of the Examiner's rejections and were done solely in the interest of expediting prosecution and allowance of the claims. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the claims as originally filed in one or more further applications.

Parent U.S. Patent No. 6,962,792

Applicants would like to point out to the Examiner that in order to expedite examination, but in no way acquiescing to the validity of the outstanding rejections, and, further, for the Examiner's convenience, the pending claims have been amended to recite similar language as in the issued claims in parent U.S. Patent No. 6,962,792.

Information Disclosure Statement

At page 12, the Office Action indicates that references cited in an Information Disclosure Statement filed on April 24, 2007 have not been received and, accordingly, all references cited "have been stricken from the IDS." Applicants submit, first, that submission of those references previously forwarded in a parent application is unnecessary in accordance with 37 CFR §1.98(d)

and, second, that Applicants did, in fact, file copies of the references with the filing of April 24, 2007 as reflected by the postcard date stamped by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on April 24, 2007, a copy of which is attached herewith as Appendix A, indicating receipt of twenty six (26) references.

Nonetheless, Applicants will file a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement, PTO Form SB/08 and a copy of the references cited therein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the cited references and acknowledge such consideration by initialing and returning a copy of the PTO Form SB/08.

Rejection of Claims 1-5, 8, 11 and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-5, 8, 11 and 12 have been rejected as "containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention." Specifically, the Examiner is of the opinion that

> [a]s applicants have argued, [Harper *et al.* (*Molecular Biology of the Cell* (1995) 6:387-400) (hereinafter referred to as "Harper")] discloses (at page 391) that all fragments of p21 are inactive in any assay which can be used to determine inhibition of a G1 cdk.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants submit that the Examiner's characterization of the teachings of Harper and of Applicants' previous arguments are incorrect. Neither Harper nor the Applicants have asserted "that all fragments of p21 are inactive in any assay which can be used to determine inhibition of a G1 cdk." Indeed, as Applicants set forth in the Response to Office Action dated April 24, 2007, "Harper teaches that amino terminal residues 1-60 of p21 '***lacked appreciable inhibitory activity***' (page 391, last paragraph of column 1)," which is a direct quote from Harper. Such comment does not amount to an assertion "that all fragments of p21 are inactive in any assay which can be used to determine inhibition of a G1 cdk," as the Examiner extrapolates. Indeed, Applicants merely seek to point out that such conclusion by Harper will lead a skilled artisan away from assessing inhibitory or binding activity of related p21 fragments on related cyclin/Cdk4 complexes.

Moreover, Applicants submit that the Examiner acknowledges that Harper does not teach "that all fragments of p21 are inactive in any assay which can be used to determine inhibition of a G1 cdk." Indeed, on page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that

> Harper discloses (page 391) that a peptide consisting of amino acids 1-60 of p21 exhibits only minimal inhibition of cyclin A/Cdk2 when histone H1 was used as a substrate. This is quite different from saying that the peptide in question (1-60 of p21) is ineffective to inhibit all G1 cdks in all assays.

Applicants further submit that while Harper teaches that ***amino terminal residues 1-60 of p21*** 'lacked appreciable inhibitory activity,' the present application sets forth that ***a p21 fragment of 40 amino acids or less which contains the xxRRyFz motif*** exhibits activity, for example, binding or inhibitory activity, with cyclin D1 and/or Cdk4 so as to allow for the identification of compounds which modulate such activity (see page 7, line 25 to page 8, line 11 and page 21, line 18 to page 32, line 28 and page 52, line 11 to page 60, line 21 of the specification). Accordingly, while Harper may teach away from the claimed invention, as set forth in the previous Response to Office Action, Harper fails to undermine the teachings of the present application that the recited p21 fragments can, in fact, be used in assays to identify compounds that modulate the binding of p21 with cyclin D1 and/or Cdk4. Indeed, based on the teachings of the present application, one skilled in the art would be able to practice the claimed invention, *i.e.*, to use the recited peptide fragments in assays to identify compounds that modulate the binding of such fragments with cyclin D1 and Cdk4, without undue experimentation.[1]

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejection of Claims 1-5, 8, 11 and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 1-5, 8, 11 and 12 have been rejected as being anticipated by Ball *et al.* (*Current Biology* (1996) 7:71-80) (hereinafter referred to as "Ball") on the ground that "Ball discloses the invention substantially as claimed."

[1] However, Applicants wish to make clear that one skilled in the art would be able to practice the claimed invention in view of the teachings of the present application and not in view of the state of the art prior to the filing of the application. Indeed, Applicants submit that prior to Applicants' invention, one skilled in the art would not have appreciated the presently claimed peptides and their role in binding or inhibiting cyclin D1 and Cdk4, particularly in view of the teachings of Harper.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Applicants submit that Ball does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C § 102(a). Indeed, Applicants submit that Ball is Applicants' own work and is not "by another," as required for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a). In support, Applicants note that an affidavit under 37 CFR § 1.132 and in accordance with M.P.E.P. § 706.02(b) and 715.01(c) will be filed shortly, thereby rendering the foregoing rejection moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the foregoing rejection.

Rejection of Claims 1-5, 8, 11 and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 8, 11 and 12 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Nakanishi *et al.* (*EMBO Journal* (1995) 14(3):555-563) (hereinafter referred to as "Nakanishi") on the ground that

> Nakanishi discloses... that peptides containing the following sequence inhibit cyclin-dependent kinases: WMNFDFXXXXPLEGXXXWXXV. As before, the issue remains that instant claim 1 does not actually require that the peptide in question contain the subsequence RryFz. In traversing, applicants have noted the examiner's previous argument and have asserted that claim 1 as amended precludes the possibility that the derivative of the peptide fragment can be a peptide which does not contain the sequence KxxRRyFzP. However, applicants are not correct. Claim 1 recites the following:
>
> > 'wherein the peptide fragment of (i) or the derivative of (ii) comprises... KxxRRyFzP'
>
> Because of the conjunction 'or', as used in claim 1, the claim has effectively eliminated any requirement that the 'substance' contain the recited 'motif' at all.

Applicants respectfully disagree. However, solely in the interest of expediting examination and in no way acquiescing to the validity of the rejection, Applicants have amended claim 1 so as to further clarify that both the peptide fragment and its derivative comprise at least the motif xxRRyFz. Specifically, claim 1 requires, in part, that "the peptide fragment of (i) ***and*** the derivative of (ii) comprise the motif KxxRRyFzP" (emphasis added), thereby rendering the foregoing rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the foregoing rejection.

Rejection of Claims 1-5, 8, 11 and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 8, 11 and 12 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Chen *et al.* (*J. Molecular & Cellular Biology* (1996) 16(9):4673-4682) (hereinafter referred to as "Chen") on the ground that "Chen discloses… the following peptide: ACRRLFGPVDSE. Chen also discloses that this, and other peptides inhibit cyclin dependent kinases."

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Specifically, Applicants submit that Chen teaches away from the claimed invention. The present invention is generally directed to methods of identifying compounds which modulate the binding between p21 and cyclin D1 and/or Cdk4. In contrast, Chen explicitly states that the ACRRLFGPVDSE peptide, referred to as the PS100 peptide in Chen, does not associate with cyclin D1 and/or Cdk4. Indeed, on page 4677 (second column, first full paragraph), Chen states, "PS100 and PS102 did not inhibit cyclin D1-Cdk4, as expected from the observation that they were insufficient to associate with the kinase complex." In addition, Table 2 on page 4677 of Chen further states that PS100 did not inhibit cyclin D1-Cdk4 kinase activity.[2]

Indeed, Chen actually teaches away from the claimed invention by teaching that the ACRRLFGPVDSE peptide cited by the Examiner does not, in fact, associate with the cyclin D1-Cdk4 complex. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would not arrive at the claimed invention, *i.e.*, one skilled in the art would not seek to identify compounds which modulate the binding between p21 and cyclin D1 and/or Cdk4, in view of the teachings of Chen.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the foregoing rejection.

Rejection of Claims 1-5, 8, 11 and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 8, 11 and 12 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Xiong *et al.* (*Nature* (1993) 366(6456):701-704) (hereinafter referred to as "Xiong") or Harper in view of Xiong on the ground that

> Xiong and Harper both teach that p21 inhibits cyclin dependent kinases; Xiong provides the sequence of p21.

[2] Table 2 notes that "[i]nhibition to 50% of basal activity is not achieved even at the highest concentration of inhibitor tested…"

> Certainly, the teachings of Harper and Xiong taken together disclose a method of inhibiting the activity of a G1 cdk by contacting the cdk with a peptide that comprises (a) a fragment of less than 40 amino acids of p21 and (b) a 'carrier' peptide, which happens to be another portion of p21. This conclusion is also reached by considering Xiong by itself. As it happens, however, this particular embodiment is excluded by the claims. But what is not excluded is 'non-p21 peptide sequences' that are rendered obvious by Xiong. Consider the following peptide, which is a fragment of p21 (in p21, this happens to be bonded to the C-terminus of SEQ ID NO:2 of the instant application):
>
> ALMAGCIQEARERWNFDFVTETPLEGDFAWER
>
> This qualifies as a 'p21 carrier' and is excluded by the claims. But consider each of the following:
>
> 1 ALM**X**GCIQEARERWNFDFVTETPLEGDFAWER…
>
> 'X' represents ethylglycine. The peptide chemist of ordinary skill would have expected that a peptide containing an alanine at a given position will exhibit substantially the same activity as an otherwise identical peptide containing ethylglycine… At the same time, this sequence would qualify as a 'non-p21 carrier'…
>
> In response to the foregoing, applicants have argued that the claims mandate that the 'substance' contain no more than 40 amino acids. However, this assertion is factually incorrect. Next, applicants have argued that a reference is deficient unless it describes which fragments of p21 can inhibit a G1 Cdk. Perhaps if claim 1 actually mandated that the 'substance' consist of 40 amino acids or less, applicants argument would have some merit. But there is no such limitation.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Neither Xiong alone or in combination with Harper render obvious the presently claimed invention, *i.e.*, a method of identifying a compound which modulates binding between p21 and cyclin D1 and/or Cdk4 by contacting the cyclin D1 and/or Cdk4 with ***a peptide fragment of 40 amino acids or less of p21*** or a derivative thereof, wherein the fragment or derivative is optionally coupled to a non-peptidyl coupling partner or, alternatively, a non-p21 peptide sequence and wherein the peptide fragment or derivative comprises at least the motif xxRRyFz.

The Examiner's rejection is predicated upon his assertion that in view of Xiong's teaching of the full length p21 sequence, one skilled in the art would be able to modify a portion of the p21 sequence such that this portion would constitute a non-p21 peptide sequence as set forth in claim 1(A)(v) and (vi). However, Applicants submit that such assertion is contrary to the teachings of the specification with respect to non-p21 peptide sequences. Indeed, as stated in the previous response, ***although not specifically addressed by the Examiner in the present Office Action, the specification defines a non-p21 peptide sequence as referring specifically to a heterologous or foreign coupling partner*** (see page 14, lines 10-11 of the specification). Accordingly, in view of the teachings of the specification, one skilled in the art would appreciate

that a modified p21 peptide sequence, as suggested by the Examiner, would not constitute a non-p21 peptide sequence, as ***the modified p21 sequence is not heterologous or foreign to the remainder of the p21 sequence***. Instead, one skilled in the art would understand the entire p21 sequence including the modified portion to be merely a derivative of the p21 sequence and not as a p21 peptide sequence coupled to a non-p21 peptide sequence, as defined by the specification.

In support of such interpretation of the term non-p21 peptide sequence, Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to M.P.E.P. § 2111.01(IV) which sets forth that where Applicants explicitly or implicitly define a term in the specification, such definition is controlling. As set forth in M.P.E.P. § 2111.01(IV),

> [w]here an explicit definition is provided by the applicant for a term, that definition will control interpretation of the term as it is used in the claim. *Toro Co. v. White Consolidated Industries Inc.*, 199 F.3d 1295, 1301, 53 USPQ2d 1065, 1069 (Fed. Cir. 1999)... The specification should also be relied on for more than just explicit lexicography or clear disavowal of claim scope to determine the meaning of a claim term when applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer; the meaning of a particular claim term may be defined by implication, that is, according to the usage of the term in >the< context in the specification. See *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, *>415 F.3d 1303<, 75 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (*en banc*); and *Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic Inc.*, 90 F.3d 1576, 1583, 39 USPQ2d 1573, 1577 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

Indeed, Applicants have clearly defined non-p21 peptide sequence for purposes of the present invention, as set forth above.

Moreover, Applicants submit that the Examiner provides no instruction or rationale as to why a skilled artisan would modify the p21 sequence in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Indeed, "[w]hile the KSR Court rejected a rigid application of the teaching, suggestion, or motivation ("TSM") test, the Court acknowledged the importance of identifying 'a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the elements in the way the claimed new invention does' in an obviousness determination." *Takeda Chem. Indus., Ltd. v. Alpharma Pty., Ltd.* (2007 U.S. App. LEXIS 15349, at *13-14 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (quoting KSR, 127 S. Ct. at 1731). In this regard, Applicants submit that the Examiner fails to provide any reason why one skilled in the art would modify the p21 sequence disclosed in Xiong in the manner suggested by the Examiner to arrive at the claimed peptides.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that Xiong fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention, as required for a proper obviousness rejection (M.P.E.P. §

2143). While Xiong discloses the full length sequence of p21, Xiong fails to teach or suggest ***a peptide fragment of 40 amino acids or less of p21*** comprising at least the motif xxRRyFz.[3] Moreover, Xiong fails to teach or suggest that such peptide fragment may be involved in binding cyclin D1 and/or Cdk4. Nor does Xiong provide guidance regarding which portions of p21 are involved in binding cyclin D1 and/or Cdk4. Lastly, Xiong fails to teach or suggest the involvement of a peptide fragment of 40 amino acids or less of p21 comprising at least the motif xxRRyFz in binding cyclin D1 and/or Cdk4 so as to allow for the identification of compounds which modulate such binding, as set forth in the present claims.

With respect to Harper, the Examiner further asserts that

> Applicants have argued that Harper discloses that a peptide which consists of amino acids 1-60 of p21 is inactive in all assays. However, this is not what the reference teaches. Harper discloses (page 391) that a peptide consisting of amino acids 1-60 of p21 exhibits only minimal inhibition of cyclin A/Cdk2 when histone H1 was used as a substrate. This is quite different from saying that the peptide in question (1-60 of p21) is ineffective to inhibit all G1 cdk's in all assays. Furthermore, even if it were true that the peptide in question (1-60 of p21) is inactive in all assays of G1 cdk activity, the rejection would still be valid. As it happens, the claims encompass the possibility that the peptide fragment be coupled to a carrier; the claims require only that the 'substance' exhibit activity, not that the 'peptide fragment' exhibit any activity.

As set forth previously, Applicants submit that the Examiner's characterization of Applicants' previous arguments is incorrect. Applicants did not previously assert "that all fragments of p21 are inactive in any assay which can be used to determine inhibition of a G1 cdk," as the Examiner suggest. In the Response to Office Action dated April 24, 2007, Applicants stated that "Harper teaches that amino terminal residues 1-60 of p21 '***lacked appreciable inhibitory activity***' (page 391, last paragraph of column 1)." Applicants submit that such comment does not amount to an assertion "that all fragments of p21 are inactive in any assay which can be used to determine inhibition of a G1 cdk," as the Examiner extrapolates. Indeed, Applicants merely seek to point out that such conclusion by Harper will lead a skilled artisan away from assessing inhibitory or binding activity of related p21 fragments on related cyclin/Cdk4 complexes.

---

[3] While the Examiner sets forth that "applicants have argued that the claims mandate that the 'substance' contain no more than 40 amino acids," Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments presented in the previous response make clear that it is the ***p21 peptide fragment that must be 40 amino acids or less, not (necessarily) the substance***. As set forth previously and as set forth herein, Applicants re-submit that Xiong fails to teach or suggest the recited p21 fragment of 40 amino acids or less.

However, in teaching that the amino terminal residues 1-60 of p21 'lacked appreciable inhibitory activity," Harper does, in fact, teach away from the claimed invention, as previously argued. Indeed, such teachings that a particular region of p21 fails to appreciably inhibit a particular cyclin/cdk complex would lead one skilled in the art away from seeking to identify a compound that modulates the binding of ***a related cyclin/cdk complex to a portion of that same region of p21***.

Applicants further submit that the teachings of Harper and Xiong in combination fail to teach each and every element of the claimed invention, as required for a proper obviousness rejection (M.P.E.P. § 2143). Indeed, Harper fails to account for the deficiencies in Xiong as discussed above. Specifically, Harper and Xiong, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest ***a peptide fragment of 40 amino acids or less of p21*** comprising at least the motif xxRRyFz. In addition, Harper and Xiong, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest that such peptide fragment may be involved in binding cyclin D1 and/or Cdk4. Moreover, Harper and Xiong, alone or in combination, fail to provide guidance as to which portions of p21 are involved in binding cyclin D1 and/or Cdk4. Lastly, Harper and Xiong, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the involvement of a peptide fragment of 40 amino acids or less of p21 comprising at least the motif xxRRyFz in binding cyclin D1 and/or Cdk4 so as to allow for the identification of compounds which modulate such binding, as set forth in the present claims.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that neither Xiong nor Harper, alone or in combination, render the claimed invention obvious, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-5, 8, 11 and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 8, 11 and 12 have also been rejected as being unpatentable over Lin *et al.* (*Molecular and Cellular Biology* (1996) 16(4):1786-1793) (hereinafter referred to as "Lin") on the ground that

> Lin discloses inhibition of cdk's by p21; also disclosed, however, is inhibition of cdk's by peptides which are mutants of p21. As such, the limitation of a 'non-p21 sequence' is met by the reference.
>
> In response, applicants have simply asserted that a given peptide which contains 'n' amino acids is somehow different from a conjugate of a 'first' peptide and 'second' peptide, wherein the 'first' peptide consists of 'm' amino acids, and the 'second' peptide consists of 'n-m' amino acids. Thus, for example, according to applicants, if one were to take the peptide YGRTV and couple it to the peptide SQWPN to form the peptide

> YGRTVSQWPN the peptide formed in this way is somehow different from simply removing the peptide YGRTVSQWPN from a vial. Applicants, however, are incorrect both as a chemical matter and a legal matter. Unless applicants can point to some chemical or physical difference between a peptide that has been synthesized by coupling together two smaller peptides, and a peptide that has been made some other way (e.g., recombinantly or by stepwise peptide synthesis), applicants' position has no merit.

Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner's rejection is predicated upon his assertion that in view of Lin's teaching of mutants of the p21 sequence, portions of such mutants would constitute a non-p21 peptide sequence as set forth in claim 1(A)(v) and (vi). However, as discussed previously in the context of Xiong, Applicants submit that such assertion is contrary to the teachings of the specification with respect to non-p21 peptide sequences. Indeed, ***the specification defines a non-p21 peptide sequence as referring specifically to a heterologous or foreign coupling partner*** (see page 14, lines 10-11 of the specification). Accordingly, in view of the teachings of the specification, one skilled in the art would appreciate that a modified p21 peptide sequence, as suggested by the Examiner, would not constitute a non-p21 peptide sequence, as ***the modified p21 sequence is not heterologous or foreign to the remainder of the p21 sequence. Instead, one skilled in the art would understand the entire p21 sequence including the modified portion to be merely a derivative of the p21 sequence and not as a p21 peptide sequence coupled to a non-p21 peptide sequence, as defined by the specification.*** Once again, Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to M.P.E.P. § 2111.01(IV) which sets forth that where Applicants explicitly or implicitly define a term in the specification, such definition is controlling.

Moreover, Applicants submit that Lin fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention, as required for a proper obviousness rejection (M.P.E.P. § 2143). Specifically, Lin fails to teach or suggest the involvement of a peptide fragment of 40 amino acids or less of p21 comprising at least the motif xxRRyFz in binding cyclin D1 and/or Cdk4 so as to allow for the identification of compounds which modulate such binding, as set forth in the present claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the foregoing rejection.

Rejection of Claims 1-5, 8, 11 and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 8, 11 and 12 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Toyoshima *et al.* (*Cell* (1994) 78:67-74) (hereinafter referred to as "Toyoshima") on the ground that

> Toyoshima discloses inhibition of cdk's by p27. Also as noted previously, the term 'fragment' in instant claim 1 could mean just one single amino acid; thus, any amino acid that is present in p21 would qualify. As such, nearly any peptide that inhibits a G1 cdk would be encompassed by the claims. In addition, claim 3 is actually much broader in scope than claim 1; one can being with a fragment of p21, select an 'active portion' of that, and then make a derivative of the 'active portion'. As such, few peptides are excluded by claim 3.
>
> In response, applicants have argued that the claims require the presence of the sequence KxxRRyFzP. As explained above in the rejection over Nakanishi, the claims do not actually require this.

Applicants respectfully disagree. However, solely in the interest of expediting examination and in no way acquiescing to the validity of the rejection, Applicants have amended claim 1 so as to further clarify that both the peptide fragment and its derivative comprise at least the motif xxRRyFz. Specifically, claim 1 requires, in part, that "the peptide fragment of (i) ***and*** the derivative of (ii) comprise the motif KxxRRyFzP" (emphasis added), thereby rendering the foregoing rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the foregoing rejection.

SUMMARY

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance. If a telephone conversation with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' Attorney at (617) 227-7400.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, in the present filing to Deposit Account No. 12-0080 under Order No. CCI-007USDV, from which the undersigned is authorized to withdraw.

Dated: January 23, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Maneesh Gulati/

Maneesh Gulati
Registration No.: 60,963
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicants

Atty Docket No.: CCI-007USDV

Inventor: Kathryn Lindsay BALL *et al.*

Application No.: 10/646267-Conf. #9453 **Filing Date:** August 22, 2003

Title: METHODS AND MEANS FOR INHIBITION OF CDK4 ACTIVITY

Documents Filed:

Transmittal (1 page)

Fee Transmittal (1 page, in duplicate)

Two Month Request for Extension of Time Under 37 CFR 1.136(a) (1 page)

Amendment and Response to Office Action (11 pages)

Copies of Priority UK Application Nos. 9521.1 and 9621314.5

Information Disclosure Statement (2 pages)

PTO Form SB/08 (2 pages)

Copies of Twenty Six (26) References

Charge $405.00 to deposit account 12-0080

Return Receipt Postcard

Via: Express Mail: Airbill No. EV 956 473 726 US

Sender's Initials: CLK/MG/kmk **Date:** April 24, 2007

Appendix A